REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-15 and 18-21 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-15 and 18-21 have been rejected by the Examiner. A Request for Continued Examination is concurrently filed herewith. Claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-21 are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0158777 to Schiff et al. (hereinafter "Schiff") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,912,571 to Serena. The Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections for at least the reasons presented herein.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended to better clarify that which the Applicant regards to be the invention. Newly amended claims 1, 8, and 15 recite, *inter alia*, "evaluating said content in view of the said selections and the indexed data, to determine a relevance of the content; and

performing an action on said content in accordance with said relevance determination and said selections."

No new matter has been entered by this amendment. Support may be found throughout the Applicant's specification and drawings. In particular, support may be found, e.g., in paragraphs [0023], [0025], and [0026].

Neither Schiff, nor Serena, alone or in combination, teaches, suggests or renders obvious the feature "evaluating said content in view of the selections and the indexed data, to determine a relevance of the content; and performing an action on said content in accordance with said relevance determination and said selections."

As recited in the Applicant's claims, the term '*selections*' is directed to user preferences: priority level and mode of presentment, which relate to a plurality of applications. The claimed invention further *indexes data* (which corresponds to *previously-conducted activities* by the user) and stores the indexed data. The claimed invention further recites "upon receiving content associated with activities currently conducted…accessing said indexed data…[and] accessing said selections…priority level, and …mode of presentment." The claimed invention then *evaluates the content* (i.e., *current user activities*) *in view of* the *indexed data* (past activities) *and selections* (i.e., user preferences) *to determine a relevance of the content*.

Thus, the _**relevance of the content is not a product of simply providing user-selected preferences**_, as disclosed in Schiff. Rather, the Applicant's claimed invention uses current user activities, which are evaluated with past user activities, and the user selections to derive a relevance value of the current activities. The action to be performed, then, depends upon results of the combination of these aforementioned actions. The result, therefore, is clearly more of a dynamic result that is unknown prior to the evaluation (i.e., not derived strictly from a user profile of preferences) and is generated as a result of various activities as described above.

Support for the amendments may be found in paragraph [0023], which states "interface profile system 114, as indicated above, determines what priority is assigned to this content by *evaluating the past activities conducted by the user* as reflected in the personal data index 122." In addition, paragraph [0025] states "*activities conducted by the user are viewed for relevance by evaluation logic engine 120*. The interface profile system 114 then accesses priority level setting previously selected by the user at step 310…Using the setting selected by the user, *as well as the relevance assigned to the content*, the interface profile system 114 performs an action on the content in accordance with the user's preferences and associated relevance factors."

Schiff, on the other hand, teaches a static profile of preferences (Abstract). Schiff provides *that actions are taken with respect to content based upon the user profile*. There is no analysis to determine relevance of a current content item based upon previous actions conducted by the user in conjunction with user preferences. Further, Schiff is directed to a user profile. It can give priorities to ads, and show them based on a priority in a portfolio (paragraph [0119]).

By contrast, in the Applicants' claimed invention, there is no portfolio, but rather it is decided how to present content by querying a data store, analyzing how relevant content is based on the state of the data store, and how to present the data based on relevance. This judgment is made automatically by the interface profile system of the invention and is not prescribed entirely by a user or user settings. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 8, and 15 are not rendered obvious by Schiff.

The Examiner further relies upon Serena for allegedly teaching a word processing application. However, the Applicants submit that, as Schiff fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious each and every feature of Applicant's independent claims 1, 8, and 15, the introduction of Serena for allegedly teaching a word processing document would not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Schiff. For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentable over Schiff in view of Serena and are in condition for allowance. Claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-21, variously depend from what should be considered allowable base claims, respectively. For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claims 4-7, 11-14, and 18-21 are also in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicant. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance is requested. It is submitted that the foregoing amendments and remarks should render the case in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, as the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious that which the Applicant deems to be the invention, it is respectfully requested that claims 1, 4-8, 11-15 and 18-21 be passed to issue.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorneys

By__/Marisa J. Dubuc/_____
    Marisa J. Dubuc
    Registration No. 46,673
    Customer No. 46429

Date: July 28, 2008

Address: 20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
            Hartford, CT 06103
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115